



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We do not understand your statement that the government has "absolutely refused in the smallest degree to prepare during these twenty-two months of world cataclysm." The government, through the speeches of our President and the most elaborate work of its committees, is about to provide the most stupendous army and navy expenditures of any peaceful nation throughout history. Your statement that there has been no "real and resolute opposition" to the pacifists sounds also to us very strange. It is, after such unsupported statements, that we are led to believe that what you call "the essential immorality" does not lie with us avowed pacifists.

You believe that the most certain way for us to insure peace is to be prepared for war. We do not believe that. We are opposed to military preparedness; but we include in this opposition all of the nations of the world. We are looking forward to the day when you will grasp this distinction and do justice to the rest of us pacifists. We quite agree with you that "we must make this nation as strong as are its convictions in reference to right and wrong." In our way we, too, are trying to bring this thing to pass. It is true that "national ideals amount to nothing if the nation lacks the power to maintain them against opposition." We are trying to overcome

the opposition. It so happens that we have, with the power at hand, maintained our ideals against the opposition of Germany upon two great occasions, and that Germany now grants that we have been the victors.

You must say, therefore, that it is not our policy to "remain helpless," but quite the contrary. Has it not occurred to you that our serious troubles with Villa have been due to the fact that that bandit considered himself "prepared"? Your opposition to "note writing" does not square with your own behavior at the time of the Russo-Japanese war, at the time of our crisis with Germany over Venezuela, and upon other occasions. We are not surprised that you look to Germany as your model; but her present plight does not overimpress us with the wisdom of her system. We are grateful to you for acknowledging that there are "pork-barrel methods in the army and navy yards." We agree with you heartily that preparedness for national power does not consist "wholly in guns and ships and armed men."

We repeat, Col. Roosevelt, that you are a pacifist. Indeed, you have done big things for peace. We welcome you. We are looking forward to the day when you will understand the rest of us, and consequently think of us a bit more kindly.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

IT is a conspicuous fact, and in the light of history a disquieting fact, that we in the United States of America find ourselves obliged to listen to the frequent and seriously intended arguments of distinguished American citizens for the adoption in our country of some European military system. Some favor the German system, some the Swiss. Our press, especially of the eastern States, generally approves of some form of conscription, which means compulsory service. New York State is indeed passing a compulsory military training bill which drafts into military training each year all unemployed boys, which means all school boys, of sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen years of age. Many, though not all, of our army officers and military experts seem to favor for this country some form of compulsory military service.

It seems to be true that the people of our country do not sense the seriousness of this new attack upon the foundations of our nation. Representative Towner, of Iowa, speaking in the House of Representatives, March 20, said:

"None of the advocates of universal compulsory military service seem disposed to discuss the effects of the adoption of such a system by the United States. Before the present war, Germany with such a system maintained a standing army on a peace footing of 688,000 men. France maintained an army of 616,000 men. If the compulsory system

in France, with a population of 40,000,000, keeps 616,000 men in arms, such a system in the United States would keep 1,500,000 men in arms."

The conclusions of the Congressman were correct, because, under a universal system of conscription, the number in the army must be based upon the population, for the reason that a selected compulsory military service is, in a democracy, ethically unwarrantable. It is true that a prominent publicist seriously suggested to us the other day the advisability of requiring military service of our colored population only, but the suggestion does not seem particularly magnanimous or promising.

In spite of this fad or cult of conscription, we do not believe that, save possibly in a case of actual war, this country can be led to adopt compulsory military service. Even during our Civil War exemptions and substitutions were so common that the draft in the North had little effect save to quicken the volume of bounties.

The proposition carries with it a form of militarism of the most pronounced and threatening type. The hope of our world is to be found in the institutions of law and order, which institutions depend, in turn, for their growth, upon a finer and saner democracy. This finer democracy can evolve only out of that finer mental and moral development which compulsory military service is especially devised to thwart. Freedom of conscience,

liberty in discussion, individual initiative, suspended judgment, willingness to abide by the decision of an arbiter, sympathetic attention to the argument of one's opponents, the teachable mind, these are in a military nation intolerable, in some cases punishable by death. Furthermore, a compulsory military service means a censored press, the choking of opinion and the strangling of liberty, for we cannot conscript bodies without conscripting minds. European compulsory military service has meant a conscripted press, a conscripted education, a conscripted religion, conscripted wealth, and a world war. Social and moral principles in a conscription State are necessarily subordinate to that State, at least so far as the conscription wing of the Government can make them. What the rivalries of religious groups were prior to 1648, our political rivalries are today. The inquisition and religious wars have for their counterparts today military conscription and political butcheries.

In an ungoverned world such as ours, we are unable to say what ought and ought not to be done with our military machine, save that it ought to be efficient; but

with our thinking, our views, and our freedom of expression, there can be no question. The killing of religious heretics got the world of religion nowhere. The killing of political heretics, as in the present war, can of itself get the world nowhere. Conscription is an attempt to curtail the freedom of men's actions and expressions. That means the closing of the safety valve of the nation, and must lead directly to an explosion. Militarism may be a necessary medicine, but, as Mr. Angell has recently pointed out, it is a medicine which will kill the patient unless sooner or later he can get along without it. America has been showing the world how to get along without this poisonous drug, at least its most poisonous ingredient known as conscription. Most of our best institutions have been largely built up by persons who left a conscripted Europe for an unconscribed America. Conscription is so unwise, contrary to the principles of our government, aristocratic, feudal, and dangerous, so altogether out of harmony with our institutions and ideals that we had believed even the idea of it simply intolerable to the American mind.

THE LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE

THE Twenty-second Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration was held May 17, 18, and 19. The attention of the members was directed to such questions as: The Possibilities of International Co-operation in the Creation or Development of Conciliatory, Arbitral, or Judicial Machinery for Adjudication of International Differences; Are Large Armaments, as such, Either Provocatives of War or Determinants of Arbitral and Judicial Settlement of International Differences; Possibilities of International Co-operation in Determining the Necessity, if any, for and Regulating the Use of Military Force, Economic Pressure, or Other Sanctions; Possibilities of International Co-operation to Increase Pan American Influence Against War; Race Issues; The Economic Motive as a Factor in War; The Monroe Doctrine; Nationalism; The Rights of Neutrals; The League to Enforce Peace, were all discussed, some with scholarly care, some with indignant fervor, and some with stirring pathos. After the first session, which was presided over by James Brown Scott, the presiding officer was William Howard Taft. William Jennings Bryan delivered an address in the midst of which, having delighted all, but far overrun the time limit, he turned to Mr. Taft and asked: "How much time have I left?" Shaking himself quickly together, Mr. Taft replied, with surprise: "I was following you, and not the time." The spontaneous graciousness of this reply was typical of Mr. Taft's altogether charming qualities as a presiding officer.

Prof. Edward A. Steiner's analysis of his own Americanism, in spite of his German birth, struck probably the deepest note of emotional appeal. The personalities contained in the address by George Haven Putnam were unfortunate and discordant. The defense of The League to Enforce Peace by Mr. Taft, Mr. Herbert S. Houston, and others, was challenged by such speakers as Alpheus H. Snow, George W. Kirchwey, and Mr. Bryan. Prof. Edward H. Krehbiel spoke upon the subject, "Nationalism, an Anachronism," and Dr. Eugene Wambaugh developed twelve articles relating to the adjustment of international law, regarding the rights and duties of neutrals, to changing conditions and specific emergencies. Rear-Admiral Austin M. Knight, president of the Naval War College at Newport, developed the view that large armaments as such do not provoke war, while Prof. William I. Hull and Dr. Charles E. Jefferson insisted that they do.

The platform unanimously adopted by the Conference reads:

"The world conditions of the past two years have confirmed the belief, often expressed in these conferences, that arbitral and judicial methods should and must increasingly prevail in settling international disputes.

"During the twentieth century the Permanent Court at The Hague has acted upon cases involving questions relating to Europe, Asia, Africa, the islands of the Pacific, and the three Americas. These questions involved financial and territorial claims, and such fundamental matters as the right to fly the national flag and to exercise jurisdiction over national military forces. These facts are clear testimony to the development of arbitration.

"The tendency of this court at The Hague to become in